REMARKS

Claims 1 to 16 are pending in this application. Claim 15 was withdrawn. Claims 1-14 and 16 have been rejected. In view of foregoing amendments and following remarks, the applicants request allowance of the application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 to 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) a being unpatentable over Ries, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0217985) (hereinafter "Ries"), in view of Phillips (U.S. Patent No. 6,425,121) (hereinafter "Phillips"), further in view of Rivera, et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0003353) (hereinafter "Rivera"), in view of Giljum, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,404,141) (hereinafter "Giljum"). Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menninger (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0048301) (hereinafter "Menninger"), in view of Ries, in view of Phillips, in view of Rivera, in view of Giljum. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menninger, in view of Ries, in view of Phillips, in view of Rivera and Giljum, in view of Bray (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,905) (hereinafter "Bray"). Applicant requests withdrawal of the outstanding rejections because these references do not teach or suggest all elements of the pending claims.

First, consider an element of claim 1 relating to authorization rules, which recites:

> authorization rules permitting the selection of form elements wherein the authorization rules include ***settings that identify the subset of the form elements accessible to the user determined via a lookup table separate from the form***,

Also consider a similar element of claim 5, which recites:

> ***enabling access to the user for developing a subset of the form elements through a lookup table separate from the form*** where the lookup table contains authorization rules associated with the user identification that include settings identifying the subset of form elements accessible to the user.

A more detailed discussion of lookup tables enabling access to a subset of form elements separate from the form can found, for example, in ¶ [27] of the specification. As far

as these claims are concerned, the above mentioned elements of claims 1 and 5 refer to rules that allow a user to select specific form elements accessible to the user based on settings identifying form elements accessible to the user that are stored on a lookup table separate from the form. The cited art does not recite this limitation.

On page 5 of the October 17, 2008 Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the *Ries* discloses authorization rules that are determined via a lookup table that include settings identifying the subset of form elements which are accessible to the user by being viewable or changeable. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that *Ries* ¶¶ [60], describing the "login brain," and [73] describing "access to only certain hooks," disclose these elements.

However, the "login brain" disclosed in *Ries* is only designed to determine whether an entity has provided valid user identification before granting certain editing access to an application as discussed in *Ries* ¶¶ [59]-[60]:

> The login brain process extracts identification parameters supplied by the editing client for verification against user and security data stored in both a security data store 212 and a user data store 214.
> **Where the login brain determines that the editing client has supplied parameters identifying him or her as a valid user of the system**, a call is made to a process referred to herein as the edit mode assembler component...

Since the login brain is used for validating users of the system and not to identify the subset of the form elements accessible to the user determined via a lookup table, the login brain does not teach these elements of claim 1 or 5.

Similarly, with respect to Examiner's assertion that Ries's description of "access to only certain hooks" discloses the aforementioned elements of claim 1, *Ries* requires that a hook first be inserted into the webpage being edited, as discussed in *Ries* ¶ [72]:

> A hook is created to identify an editable portion of a web page, in addition to providing the edit brain with indication of the type of content identified by the hook, step 310. Data is also added to the hook data store to enable the edit brain to identify the type of data encapsulated or described by the hook and enable updates to the web page or data store in response to edits generated by an editing client step 310. **The hook data is added to the appropriate location within the web page**, step 312. **The process of generating hook data 310 and placing hooks within web pages at desired locations to identify editable portions of a web page 312 is repeated** for each editable portion on each web page comprising the web site.

Tables 1, 2, and 3 on page 6 of *Ries* also show further examples of hooks inserted into the content of a form or webpage. However, by inserting these hooks into the content of a form or webpage *Ries* is not teaching identifying a subset of the form elements accessible to the user determined "via a lookup table **separate from the form**" as required in claims 1 and 5. Since neither *Ries* nor any of the other references cited by the Examiner teach this limitation, the rejection should be withdrawn for this reason as well.

Since claims 2 to 4 and 16 depend on claim 1, the rejection for these dependent claims should be withdrawn as well. Since claims 6 to 8 depend on claim 5, the rejection of these dependent claims should also be withdrawn.

Second, consider similar elements of method claim 9 which recite:

> **retrieving a permission list from a lookup table separate from the form** using an identifier associated with the user, **the permission list identifying access rights for developing a plurality of form elements contained in the form**, the form elements including an element for global attributes of the electronic form including the layout of the electronic form;
> **comparing the identifier associated with the user to the access rights for the form element to be changed through the lookup table separate from the form**... .

By its express terms, these elements of claim 9 refer to retrieving a permission list identifying access rights for developing certain form elements from a lookup table separate from the form and then comparing the access rights from the permission list with the user identifier through the lookup table separate from the form. Because the identification and assessment of access rights is being conducted **separate from the form**, these elements are not disclosed or suggested in the prior art cited by the Examiner for the same reasons discussed in the previous paragraphs. Accordingly the rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn. Since claims 10-14 depend on claim 9, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn as well.

CONCLUSION

All outstanding rejections have been overcome. It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is in clear condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Office is invited to contact the undersigned at 212-908-6451 to discuss any matter regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: December 22, 2008

By: _____

Ishak Akyuz
Registration No. 61,125

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1 Broadway
New York, NY 10004
Tel.: (212) 425-7200
Fax.: (212) 425-5288
CUSTOMER NO. 53000